

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 were amended. Accordingly, claims 1-18 remain at issue in the above-identified application.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Tsutsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,391). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during a telephone conferences on June 7, 2004. During the telephone conference, Applicant's attorney discussed an amendment to claims 1 and 10 to clarify that the method and apparatus protect the storage area of the medium storing the second string of codes from any recording, editing and erasing operations of the first apparatus, while allowing reproducing operations of the first apparatus, on the basis of the protection information when the medium storing the second string of codes is operated by the first apparatus.

Tsutsui et al. is directed to an information encoding/decoding method where if codes of an old standard and codes of a new standard are recorded on the same recording medium, signals of the old standard can be reproduced by the reproducing device designed compatible with the old standard, while signals of the new standard and those of the old standard can be reproduced by the reproducing device designed compatible with the new standard. See column 5, lines 19-28. Thus, Tsutsui et al. protects the recording medium storing signals of the new standard from reproducing operations of the reproducing device designed compatible with the old standard.

Tsutsui et al. does not disclose or suggest protecting the storage area of the medium storing the second string of codes from any recording, editing and erasing operations of the first apparatus, while allowing reproducing operations of the first apparatus, on the basis of the protection information when the medium storing the second string of codes is operated by the first apparatus, as required by claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10, and all claims that depend from these claims, are allowable over Tsutsui et al., and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsutsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,391) in view of Nakashima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,650). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Tsutsui et al. does not disclose or suggest protecting the storage area of the medium storing the second string of codes from any recording, editing and erasing operations of the first apparatus, while allowing reproducing operations of the first apparatus, on the basis of the protection information when the medium storing the second string of codes is operated by the first apparatus, as required by claims 1 and 10. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tsutsui et al. and Nakashima et al. to derive claims 5 and 14, which depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsutsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,391) in view of Takezawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,265). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.


As discussed above, Tsutsui et al. does not disclose or suggest protecting the storage area of the medium storing the second string of codes from any recording, editing and erasing operations of the first apparatus, while allowing reproducing operations of the first apparatus, on the basis of the protection information when the medium storing the second string of codes is operated by the first apparatus, as required by claims 1 and 10. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tsutsui et al. and Takezawa et al. to derive claims 9 and 18, which ultimately depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 7, 2004

By:   
Marina N. Saito  
Registration No. 42,121  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000